

DD/S REGISTRY
FILE *Training 3*

Colonel White

For information. You may find Ben's
comments very interesting.

SIGNED R. L. Bannerman
R. L. Bannerman
18 SEP 1969

DD/S:RLB:maq (18 Sept 69)

Distribution:

Orig - ExDir w/ccy DD/S 69-4228

1 - DD/S Subject

1 - DD/S Chrono

DD/S 69-4228: Memo dtd 3 Sept 69 for DTR fr subj: Report of
Attendance at the Executive Institute

STA

STAT

Next 4 Page(s) In Document Exempt

ADMINISTRATIVE
INTERNAL USE ONLY

DD/S 69-4228

3 SEP 1969

Executive Registry

69-4633

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

SUBJECT : Report of Attendance at the Federal
Executive Institute

1. This memorandum reports on my attendance at the Federal Executive Institute (FEI) during the running of its fourth session, 28 April-20 June 1969.

2. Let me first note that I have reviewed reports submitted by my three Agency predecessors at the FEI. Much of what has already been reported (particularly by Mr. [REDACTED] in his detailed and comprehensive evaluation) could be included in my own account. Since program content, allocation of time to various segments, general approach, etc., were essentially the same in the fourth session as they were in the preceding three, I hope you will agree with my not repeating all that has already been said.

3. In simple terms, the FEI brings together a number of executives (That is the FEI's term, not mine.) and offers them the benefits of a new approach to executive development-- a learning concept based on three assumptions: the individual does make a difference in the leadership activity; a leader must have followers and depends on them, as they do on him; the federal executive has a special obligation to know his environment and to represent his organization in that environment. From these assumptions flow, then, three goals of the Institute:

- a. To heighten responsiveness to national needs and goals;

STA

ADMINISTRATIVE

INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE
INTERNAL USE ONLY

- 2 -

- b. to increase appreciation of the totality of the governmental system; and
- c. to improve knowledge of managerial processes.

4. I believe the Institute scored well in achieving its goals. With that said, I wish now to add some observations to those previously supplied by CIA attendees at the FEI:

a. From the first moment- actually even earlier, in the material sent to each of us in advance- the faculty attempted to place on us individually and collectively the responsibility for determining the substance, conduct, and success of personal and group learning; they said that the major burden for our learning fell on us, and they meant it. In many ways, participant attitudes toward the FEI were influenced by the extent to which the responsibility was accepted.

b. It came as quite a surprise that the action emphasis of the FEI was not management training. After all, our agencies were investing approximately \$7,000 per man. So despite what the literature said, we expected that the most important job to be done was to learn how to be good managers. As I perceived it, the thrust of the FEI was to each of us as human beings- to sharpen our awareness and understanding of ourselves and the world around us and to help us develop and embark on a program of personal growth and self-renewal. Frank Sherwood, the Institute's Director, is absolutely convinced that officials in the top few echelons of government have on "blindness". They do their jobs well, perhaps, but they know little and understand less of the major problems of the world, such as race, poverty, urban crisis, population, pollution, education, etc.

ADMINISTRATIVE

INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE
INTERNAL USE ONLY

Thus, it was only natural for him to develop and offer a program at the FEI which exposed participants to some of these critical issues. Sherwood's hope is that as one's learning experience at the FEI broadens and deepens he will become a better human being; inevitably, Sherwood believes, this will make the individual a better leader and manager.

c. Except for a few mandatory segments, e.g., attending lectures by outside guest speakers, we could do almost anything we wanted, even if only to read for the entire 8 weeks. Quite a "boondoggle" opportunity, yet it was interesting to see how little abuse there was of this freedom. Almost all of us tried to participate actively not, as was noted in other evaluations, because we were expected to or thought we should but, rather, because the curriculum offered something of interest to most of us. Almost all participants were conscientious members of the community, who took seriously the investment of time and money which supported our attendance at the FEI.

d. Our group's overall impression of the FEI's purpose, goals, and substance was favorable, although we had some criticisms to make about certain aspects of program content. For example, during the first week we were divided into smaller groups of 8-10 persons with a faculty member as an advisor. These groups met regularly throughout the 8 weeks primarily to discuss individual goals and progress. We soon became disenchanted, actually annoyed, with those discussions (and regularly said so) because too much time, needed so badly elsewhere, was devoted to what had the appearance of "home-room" sessions. It didn't

ADMINISTRATIVE

INTERNAL USE ONLY

**ADMINISTRATIVE
INTERNAL USE ONLY**

help us when we learned that participants in the preceding sessions had also criticized this mandatory part of the program. With the emphasis given to feedback from the participants to the faculty- we actually began to question whether the faculty was being honest with us in describing the importance of feedback since despite criticism in earlier sessions, no change had been made. By his own admission, the Director is still struggling with this and other aspects of his program. Some of the problems can be attributed to the fact that Sherwood is trying to please everyone. This is a mistake, and we told him so. He has about reached the conclusion that in assembling a group of 55-60 senior government officials, with different backgrounds, experiences, and personalities, the chances are strong that the program will please some but not all. We suggested that he not worry about it, so long as the program is designed in such a way as to offer a range of choices, varied enough to attract the interest of most participants.

e. As mentioned earlier, most of the activity at the FEI is optional (one of the key words at the FEI is "opt"; we were always opting for or against something), and the curriculum is almost totally unstructured. Each participant was free to decide for himself what he wanted to do. Some of the participants found this freedom of choice hard to handle and actually complained that the faculty had abdicated its responsibility to them in not dictating the substance and direction of their FEI training. They never did grasp the concept of the "learning community" described so carefully in the literature and by the faculty. As one might guess, these persons were those used to a neat, structured way of life and work which suggests, perhaps, that sponsoring agencies should be more careful in their selection of candidates and nominate only those individuals able to adapt to the FEI's unstructured approach.

ADMINISTRATIVE**INTERNAL USE ONLY**

ADMINISTRATIVE
INTERNAL USE ONLY
- 5 -

f. For eight weeks, each participant is in almost constant contact for approximately 12-13 hours a day with others, participating in group discussions, mealtime bull sessions, recreation, projects, workshops, labs and the like. Life at the FEI is almost entirely one of interaction, including confrontation. Unfortunately for them, our session had at least two "loners" in a group of 55. They usually sat silently during the seminars and other group discussions, contributed little if anything during mealtime and recreation discussions, and generally, seemed uncomfortable in the climate of interaction which existed. For them, the 8 weeks must have been a terrible burden. Of equal concern, the session was denied their contribution. Perhaps the FEI should alert sponsoring agencies to nominate only individuals who can adapt to a situation where interaction, active participation, and mixing are essential to a successful FEI learning experience.

g. Much of the program and many of the experiences at the FEI can be duplicated by the Agency: guest speakers, workshops, seminar, personal growth laboratories. What can not, at least not easily, is that which had the greatest meaning for me - association with 54 senior federal officials from many different agencies. Each brought important knowledge, experiences, and viewpoints to the session. Some are men of great stature in their fields and most hold important positions. (See attached roster.) I shall long remember the countless hours of discussions with these men, and if I learned or got nothing else from the 8 weeks this opportunity alone was worth the entire price.

5. In summary, I join my predecessors in endorsing the Agency's continued participation in the FEI program. Even with some growing pains and problems, Sherwood really has a good thing going in Charlottesville.

ADMINISTRATIVE
INTERNAL USE ONLY

6. A few words now about Agency representation at the FEI.

a. The presence of a CIA official in any group of persons is usually a new experience for the others. Certainly this was true in my session. There was a lot of needling and curiosity, mostly friendly but occasionally sharp. I honestly believe that it would have been deadly for me to avoid such contact or to merely listen, neither reacting nor responding, since this could have intensified the attention given to me. Rather, and alerted by remarks in earlier evaluations, I joined the discussions, answered questions, and even volunteered information. In this connection, I find it necessary to comment on Mr. [] statement in paragraph 8 of his evaluation that "... the climate at the Institute is such that the CIA label, good or bad, will disappear...." Interest in CIA during our session was genuine, but the lack of even basic knowledge about CIA was startling. I fear that shortcomings of a poor Agency representative might tend to create, reinforce, or even confirm unfavorable impressions that ill-informed participants and even faculty members have of the Agency. I can give the following example because it occurred too early in my session to apply to me: I was informally chatting with Sherwood one day about the kind of officers being nominated by various agencies to attend the FEI. During the course of this discussion Sherwood stated that he had developed a completely different impression of CIA. By virtue of the type person the Agency had sent, he said he now believed that CIA has entrusted sensitive and responsible tasks to persons who can handle them without overstepping authority and bounds, as had been charged. A real compliment to Knoche, [] and Smith certainly, but Sherwood's remarks also prove how critical it is to evaluate the representation aspects of CIA attendance at the FEI and to select our nominees accordingly.

STA

AT

ADMINISTRATIVE

ADMINISTRATIVE
INTERNAL USE ONLY

b. In paragraph 4f above, I noted the importance of sending representatives to the FEI who can survive in a climate of interaction with a number of senior officials from other Federal agencies. This is even more true for our nominees because, as noted above, normal interest in CIA will force our man into the spotlight. We must be sure that he can handle this; and do so well.

c. In addition to the performances of other CIA attendees, I had other reasons to be proud of the Agency record of achievement at the FEI. [] is doing an outstanding job as a faculty member, and he was highly regarded by most participants in our session. In addition, George Carver was one of our guest speakers. His presentation on certain aspects of Vietnam was simply magnificent.

STAT

7. Please let me know if there is any additional information I can supply.

[]
Deputy Director of Personnel
for Special Programs

STAT

Att

ADMINISTRATIVE

INTERNAL USE ONLY

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE INSTITUTE

Charlottesville, Virginia

SESSION IV

April 28 - June 20, 1969

Prepared April 29, 1969

Final Roster

-2-

15. HARLESS, Raymond F. 210
Assistant Regional Commissioner
(Audit)
Western Regional Office
Internal Revenue Service
TREASURY DEPARTMENT
San Francisco, California
16. HOLLOWAY, William J. 300B
Chief, East Coast Branch
Division of Equal Educational
Opportunities
Office of Education
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
AND WELFARE
Washington, D. C.
17. HUTCHINSON, William E. 300C
Deputy Assistant Director
(Administration)
Office of Administration
U. S. INFORMATION AGENCY
Washington, D. C.
18. ISON, Donald 303
Chief Examiner, District 5
Office of Examination and
Supervision
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD
Cincinnati, Ohio
19. JENSEN, Johannes E. 317
Associate Director
Planning and Development
National Park Service
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Washington, D. C.
20. KAUFMAN, Gene 318
Chief, Program Review Division
Office of Public Works
Economic Development Administration
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Washington, D. C.
21. KING, Thomas A. 304
Director, Atlantic Coast District
U. S. MARITIME ADMINISTRATION
New York, New York
22. KIRSE, Otto J. 319
Chief, Office of Tariffs and Infor-
mal Complaints (Foreign Commerce)
Bureau of Compliance
FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION
Washington, D. C.
23. KORYCINSKI, Peter F. 204
Executive Assistant to the Director
Langley Research Center
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION
Hampton, Virginia
24. KURELICH, John R. 320
Director, Office of Financial
Systems and Services
Office of the Assistant Secretary
for Administration
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
Washington, D. C.
25. LASKER, Matthias 356
Policy Specialist
Director, Grants Administration
Policy
Office of the Secretary
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
AND WELFARE
Washington, D. C.
26. LEAK, John S. 211
Technical Advisor
1002d Inspector General Group
Directorate of Aerospace Safety
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
Norton Air Force Base, California

-3-

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>27. LIVINGSTON, John B. 321 Section Engineer, Submarine Section Strategic Systems Project Office DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY Washington, D. C.</p> | <p>33. McSWAIN, Charlton C. 306 Assistant Manager for Admin- istration Chicago Office ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION Washington, D. C.</p> |
| <p>28. LURIE, Leonard J. 322 Deputy Director, Office of Labor- Management and Welfare-Pension Reports Labor-Management Services Administration DEPARTMENT OF LABOR Silver Spring, Maryland</p> | <p>34. MARKHAM, G. Emerson 324 Director of Programming Bureau of Finance and Admin- istration POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT Washington, D. C.</p> |
| <p>29. MacNAMARA, William S. 357 Chief, Field Investigation Division Bureau of Aviation Safety National Transportation Safety Board DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Washington, D. C.</p> | <p>35. 325 STA Deputy Director, Office of Security Personnel Management Group NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY Fort George G. Meade, Maryland</p> |
| <p>30. McCARTY, James, Jr. 212 Deputy Regional Director of Southwest Region Federal Water Pollution Control Administration DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR San Francisco, California</p> | <p>36. MINNICH, L. Arthur 326 Director, Secretariat, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO DEPARTMENT OF STATE Washington, D. C.</p> |
| <p>31. McENIRY, Mary A. 209 Chief, Regulations and Policy Office Bureau of Medicine Food and Drug Administration DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE Washington, D. C.</p> | <p>37. NEASE, James H. 327 Director, Bureau of Hearings and Appeals Social Security Administration DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE Washington, D. C.</p> |
| <p>32. McGLADE, Henry D. 323 Supervisory Budget Analyst Office of the Chief of Staff DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY Washington, D. C.</p> | <p>38. NEUMAN, Frederick 253 Deputy for Audit Management DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY Alexandria, Virginia</p> |
| | <p>39. PANICH, Walter 250 Associate Director for Investi- gative Service Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Washington, D. C.</p> |

-4-

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>40. PAPPERMAN, Solomon 251 Chief, Legislative and Policy Division Bureau of Retirement, Insurance and Occupational Health CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION Washington, D. C.</p> | <p>46. SHARKEY, John E. 350 Financial Management Officer Financial Management Branch National Institutes of Health DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE Bethesda, Maryland</p> |
| <p>41. PHILLIPS, John O. 256 Associate Director Office of Geodesy and Photo- grammetry Environmental Science Services Administration DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Rockville, Maryland</p> | <p>47. SHON, Frederick J. 351 Assistant Director for Nuclear Facilities Division of Operational Safety ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION Bethesda, Maryland</p> |
| <p>42. RINGENBERG, Merl G. 254 Chief, Commodity Management and Customer Relations Office DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland</p> | <p>48. STAGE, Thomas B. 302 Director Veterans Administration Hospital VETERANS ADMINISTRATION Salem, Virginia</p> |
| <p>43. SACKS, Martin 257 Staff Assistant to the Assistant Administrator Office of Special Contracts Negotiation and Review NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION Washington, D. C.</p> | <p>49. STINGLEY, Vern G. 353 Advisor, Radio Frequency Matters Office of the Chief of Naval Operations DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY Washington, D. C.</p> |
| <p>44. SAYLOR, James W. 259 Director, Research and Develop- ment Accounting Systems Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE Washington, D. C.</p> | <p>50. STRACHAN, John R. 301 Postmaster New York City Post Office POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT New York, New York</p> |
| <p>45. SCHANIEL, Carl L. 215 Assistant Technical Director for Plan and Head, Weapons Planning Group Naval Weapons Center DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY China Lake, California</p> | <p>51. SULLIVAN, Reardon S. 311 Budget Examiner Executive Office of the President BUREAU OF THE BUDGET Washington, D. C.</p> |
| | <p>52. TAYLOR, Robert H. 202 Special Agent in Charge Presidential Protective Division U.S. Secret Service TREASURY DEPARTMENT Washington, D. C.</p> |

-5-

53. VAN SCHILFGAARDE, Jan 354
Agricultural Administrator
Soil and Water Conservation
Research Division
Agricultural Research Service
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Beltsville, Maryland
54. VANNEMAN, Samuel C. 355
Assistant Deputy Administrator
Consumer Food Programs
Consumer and Marketing Service
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Washington, D. C.
55. VOLZ, J. Leonard 358
Regional Director, Southeast Region
National Park Service
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Richmond, Virginia